

The Examiner is requested to indicate approval of the proposed drawing change.

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Schrenk et al (5,202,074). Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to better define the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention, and to patentably distinguish over the cited prior art. Claims 1 and 2 as amended define that the flow device assembly has a flow channel which is arranged along the product material channel such that the flow path extends through the flow channel, and the flow device actuation assembly is operably connected to alter a posture of the flow channel with respect to the product material channel, thereby altering pressure and/or flow rate conditions of the product material in the flow path.

Schrenk et al. disclose a method of making multilayer plastic articles. Schrenk et al. teach that an intermittent injection molding process can be included in a continuous molding operation by using valves to direct flow to an accumulator for one injection mold while material is being formed in another injection mold (column 14, lines 55-64). Thus, Schrenk et al. teach the use of a diverter valve to direct material in one direction or another. Schrenk et al. do not teach or suggest that a flow device assembly can have an adjustable flow channel for controlling flow rate conditions of the material, as particularly and distinctly defined in amended claims 1-2. Therefore, claims 1-2 are believed to be patentable over Schrenk et al. New claim 16, which depends from claim 1, is believed to be allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hendry (5,728,410). Independent claim 3 has been amended with regard to formal matters. Claim 3 includes the step of: (c) altering a posture of the flow channel with respect to the adjacent portions of the flow

path so that said flow channel is offset from said adjacent portions of the flow path (underlining added for emphasis).

Hendry discloses an injection molding system wherein pressurized gas (34) is introduced into a mold cavity (21) to displace a portion of fluid plastic into a spill cavity (24). In Hendry, a flow path may be considered to extend through a flow channel (23) which is adjacent to the mold cavity (21 and the spill cavity (24). Hendry teaches that a movable piston (30) provides the spill cavity with a variable volume. Hendry does not teach or suggest any alteration of the posture of the flow channel (23) with respect to the mold cavity and the spill cavity, and therefore, the flow channel of Hendry does not become offset with respect to the adjacent mold cavity and spill cavity. Therefore, claim 3 is believed to be patentable over Hendry, and claim 4 is believed to be allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claims 5-11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Shah (5,304,341), and claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah in view of Maus et al. (4,900,242). Claims 5-15 have been canceled by this amendment, and the rejection of these claims is deemed moot.

Claims 1-4 and 16 are believed to be allowable. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Case Cornelis Rodenburgh,
et al.

Applicants


Robert J. Kapalka

Registration No. 34198
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: (302) 633-2771
Facsimile: (302) 633-2776